

As for having a Standard on present type, I think this all wrong, the present type is getting more exaggerated every year. Let the Standard be based on the work that is expected of the breed, not in the form that is being ventilated by "mug hunters." I have no patience with those who are always raking up the old timers, those who write about them ought to be ashamed of themselves. They who admired them allowed the old type to run down so far that if it had not been for Dr. Boulton, Mr. Bullock, and Mr. Easton, and one or two others whose names I forget, who seized on what was good of what was left we should not have a Cocker at all. Yet the old timers are always throwing mud into the faces of those who have been of the greatest benefit to the breed which they pretend to admire. I should hail with delight bi-colored and tri-colored Spaniels, but these breeds have been so much neglected that if a few good specimens could be obtained, it would be years before they would be made anything like uniform. No doubt, the modern Cocker by careful breeding has been made typical, yet it has in my mind been overdone, and in breeding to type they have lost their usefulness. If the Cocker Spaniel breeders would listen to reason, and not take the view of it that they do, which is, that all that do not agree with the present type must be disappointed exhibitors. I am not a disappointed exhibitor, as I never showed a Spaniel that I did not take either first or second with, more often the former, but I ceased showing when I found that type was taking the place of usefulness. Let us try and unite the two essential qualities and the woods will again be gladdened by the voice of the merry working Spaniel.

Yours, etc.,

J. S. NIVEN.

London.

*Editor Kennel Gazette:—*

I wish to correct a wrong impression given in my article of last issue, (signed A. K. Nuck) in which I stated: "dogs I now have are black, so short in leg and large in body, that when they attempt to turn quickly, they fall over on their backs."

I should have said puppies, as they were only six months old at time of writing.

Yours truly,

HARRY A. CARTER.

Simcoe.

#### ARE DOGS A NECESSITY.

Mr. Jno. Dryden M.P.P. of Brooklyn, Ont., thus discourses in the *Farmer's Advocate* for June.

He certainly speaks to the point and the figures which he quotes will be a matter of surprise to one who has never given the matter any attention.

Mr. Dryden says:—

This question will be answered by different persons in accordance with the circumstances in which they are placed, and their early education. To the shepherd, handling large flocks of sheep without any other assistance than his dog or dogs, they are certainly a necessity. But to an ordinary farmer in this country who has no such work to perform, I unhesitatingly affirm that the presence of a dog on a farm is not at all essential. Nor are dogs generally kept because of their usefulness. The affirmation was made in the legislature, and elsewhere as well, that not one dog in fifty, take them as they come can be proven to be of any use whatever. They are nearly always pets of the family, as much endeared and doted upon as any member of it. No one may harm it without incurring the ill-will of almost every member. Such persons think they cannot do without their dog, but any outside opinion of the same dog would be of an utterly reverse nature. For at least twenty years in the past, on my farm of four hundred acres and upwards no dog

has been allowed; not because there is no fondness for pets, because that is a characteristic of the family; but because the conviction has been growing that a dog is not needed, and may prove not only useless but destructive and even dangerous. He has, therefore, been discarded, and no inducement could be given after these years of experience, strong enough to cause one now to be kept.

There are some useful dogs, but they are vastly in the minority. Few people have taken the trouble to inquire what the dogs of our country cost to maintain. Early last winter, from actual returns received from the township municipalities in south riding of Ontario, I discover fully \$1,000 worth of sheep were destroyed annually by dogs. Presuming that the same deathrate occurs in north riding, we have an annual destruction in the County of Ontario of two thousand dollars. This has been going on from year to year for a long time. In 1882 a return was asked for in the legislature, showing the number of sheep killed and injured for the three years previous. Out of four hundred and eighty municipalities only one hundred and thirty were heard from, which is less than one third of the whole. In these municipalities the return showed that the number destroyed for the three years was 9,943. Total amount paid, \$38,611. But this it will be remembered, covers only two-thirds of the actual value. If we add one-third, we shall have \$51,494 as showing the actual value of sheep destroyed during the three years covered by the return. But as only one third of the Province was included in that return, and assuming that destruction was similar in the portions not reported, we have the astonishing sum of \$154,497 worth of sheep destroyed in the Province of Ontario during those three years, or an average of \$50,000 each year.

If it be any comfort to know that